



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,358	03/25/2004	Jeff A. Lambert	200312909-1	4732
22879	7590	05/03/2006	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			PAPE, ZACHARY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2835	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/808,358

Applicant(s)

LAMBERT ET AL.

Examiner

Zachary M. Pape

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The following detailed action is in response to the correspondence dated 2/16/2006.

The examiner has withdrawn the objection to claims 1,2,6 and 7 in view of the amendment to said claims. The examiner thanks the applicants' for their timely amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu (US 5,564,930 – herein after referred to as Yu '930) in view of Yu (US 6,059,386– herein after referred to as Yu '386).

With respect to claims 1 and 6, Yu '930 teaches a chassis (12) for an electronic device (10), comprising: a plurality of exterior walls (as shown in Fig 1) joined to each other to form a partially-assembled chassis, and a plurality of substantially planar interchangeable access panels (Fig 2 element 50, Fig 5 element 90) each removably attachable to the partially-assembled chassis (Via 62, 64, 72) so as to occupy at least a portion of the exterior wall vacancy (Column 3, Lines 49-52; Column 4 Lines 61-65), wherein each such access panel has a unique configuration of one or more apertures

Art Unit: 2835

each providing operational access to components housed in the chassis, whereby a completely-assembled chassis is attained by removably attaching any of the plurality of interchangeable access panels to the partially-assembled chassis. Yu '930 fails to teach that at least one exterior wall is entirely vacated. Yu '386 teaches a computer chassis for an electronic device comprising a vacated exterior wall (20) which can be placed in the vacated portion to complete the full assembly of the chassis (As illustrated in Fig 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the interchangeable access panel of Yu '930 to include the entire rear panel as taught by Yu '386 to provide better access to the components of the computer system (See Column 1, Lines 40-42; having a removable panel as taught by Yu '386 provides for better access to the components compared to the partial opening of Yu '930).

With respect to claim 2, Yu '930 further teaches an interlocking system comprising at least one interlocking mechanism (68, 72) operably positioned at one or more locations in one or more of the partially-assembled chassis and each of the plurality of interchangeable access panels (tabs 58, 60, 62, 64, 66), wherein each interlocking mechanism detachably secures at least a portion of a selected interchangeable access panel to the partially-assembled chassis. (Column 3, Lines 49-52)

With respect to claim 3, Yu '930 further teaches that the configurations of one or more operational access apertures comprises one or more of the group comprising: at

Art Unit: 2835

least one port aperture (98, 100); at least one expansion slot aperture (106); at least one power supply aperture; and at least one ventilation apertures.

With respect to claim 4, the teachings of the computer of Yu '930 being a server is implicit in that the definition of a server (a computer in a network that is used to provide services (i.e. as access to files or shared peripherals or the routing of e-mail) to other computers in the network) allows the computer of Yu '930 to act as a server if desired by the user.

With respect to claim 5, Yu '930 further teaches that the electronic device is a personal computer (Column 3, Lines 8-10).

With respect to claim 7, Yu '930 further teaches an interlocking system comprising at least one interlocking mechanism (68, 72) operably positioned at one or more locations in either or both the partially-assembled chassis and each of the plurality of interchangeable access panels (tabs 58, 60, 62, 64, 66), wherein each interlocking mechanism detachably secures at least a portion of a selected interchangeable access panel to the partially-assembled chassis. (Column 3, Lines 49-52)

With respect to claim 9, Yu '930 further teaches that each configuration of at least one operational access aperture comprises a combination of one or more characteristics of aperture size, dimensions, quantity, orientation, relative position, location, and type of supported operational access. (As illustrated in Fig 5, i.e. 94 is capable of connecting a keyboard, and 102 a parallel cable, and the location of 94 differs from the location of 106)

With respect to claim 10, Yu '930 further teaches that the configuration of one or more operational access apertures (50, 90) of at least one of the interchangeable each access panels comprises: at least one port aperture. (Fig 5, 98, 100, etc)

With respect to claim 11, Yu '930 further teaches that the configuration of one or more operational access apertures (50, 90) of at least one of the interchangeable each access panels comprises: at least one expansion slot aperture. (Fig 5, 106)

With respect to claim 12, Yu '930 further teaches that the configuration of one or more operational access apertures of at least one of the interchangeable each access panels comprises: at least one power supply aperture (88, see column 4, Lines 21-24 where aperture 88 is for a connector which supplies power from the motherboard to the peripheral attached thereto).

With respect to claim 13, Yu '930 further teaches the use of one ventilation aperture (Any of the unused apertures (i.e. 106) can act as a means to ventilate the internal components of the chassis with ambient air).

With respect to claim 14, Yu '930 fails to specifically teach that the electronic device is a server, however the mere definition of a server (a computer in a network that is used to provide services (as access to files or shared peripherals or the routing of e-mail) to other computers in the network) allows the computer of Yu '930 to act as a server if desired by the user.

With respect to claim 15, Yu '930 further teaches that the electronic device is a personal computer (Column 3, Lines 8-10).

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 2/16/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. With respect to the applicants' remarks to claims 1 and 6 that, "The detachable board 20 (of Yu '386) is clearly not substantially planar as currently claimed by 1 and 6" the examiner respectfully notes that it was never the examiners position that Yu '386 teaches the "interchangeable panel" as claimed, rather that Yu '930 taught the "interchangeable panel". As admitted by the applicants, Yu '930 does teach an interchangeable panel which is substantially planar (See applicants' present remarks page 6, paragraph 9, "Furthermore, although Yu '980 (Examiner believes applicants intended to state Yu '930) does provide an access panel in substantially planar". Therefore the examiner has properly rejected every element of the claimed invention.

4. In response to applicants' remarks that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the examiner respectfully asserts that the Yu '386 reference teaches the motivation listed by the examiner (See Column 1, Lines 40-42, "The present invention provides a computer

Art Unit: 2835

case, which facilitates the replacement, update, and maintenance of computer equipment”).

With respect to the applicants' remarks to claims 1 and 6 that, “Yu '386 does not teach or suggest an entire rear panel”, the examine respectfully notes that it was never the examiners position that Yu '386 teaches an entirely vacated rear panel (Applicants are directed to previous office action page 3) as asserted by the applicants, rather that the examiner was using Yu '386 only to teach vacating an entire wall of a chassis as claimed.

5. With respect to the applicants' remarks to claims 1 and 6 that, “Yu '980 and Yu '386 are directed to different problems and describe different structures which are not combinable components”, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In the present case it was never the examiners position to bodily incorporate the two structures, rather the examiner is merely using the Yu '386 reference to teach “at least one exterior wall.. entirely vacated” as claimed.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zachary M. Pape whose telephone number is 571-272-2201. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thur. & every other Fri. (8:00am - 5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached at 571-272-2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2835

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ZMP


LISA LEA-EDMONDS
PRIMARY EXAMINER